

APPENDIX E COMMENT RESPONSE SUMMARY

COMMENTOR INDEX

Commentors	Affiliation	Comment Codes	Corresponding Comment/Response Numbers
Elmer and Elaine Dudden (2 letters)	Private	DD-1 through DD-11	1, 11, 14-18, 32-34, 36
Pleasant View Metro District	Public Metro District	PVMD-1 through PVMD-10	2-5, 12, 19, 29-31, 40
City of Golden	Public - City	COG-1 through COG-3	8, 24-25
City of Lakewood	Public - City	COL-1 through COL-6	6-7, 22-23, 35
Colorado Department of Public Safety	Public – State	CDPS-1	21
Jefferson County Economic Council	Public – County	JEC-1 through JEC-2	20, 37
Jane Sotelo and Lee McLaughlin	Private	JSLM-1 through JSLM-9	9-10, 26-27, 38-39, 41-43
Tomoko Jensen-Otsu	Private	TJO-1 through TJO-5	13, 28, 44-46

FINAL NREL SWEA/S-II COMMENT SUMMARY

DOE appreciates public participation in the NEPA process. DOE encourages the public to maintain an open dialogue. DOE has used public comments to aid in its decision-making process and in finalizing this SWEA/S-II. All changes made in the finalization of this SWEA/S-II are marked with sidebars in the left margin.

COMMENTS ON ALTERNATIVE CORRIDORS

General Corridor Comments

1. **Comment:** We would like to say that we support NREL and its many environmental programs. I would just like to see them carried out without the negative consequences of dumping hundreds of cars, at all hours of day and night, between two established neighborhoods. **(DD-10)**

Response: DOE appreciates the support expressed for its environmental programs and views the expansion of the research and development conducted at NREL as vital to advancing the nation's use of renewable energy sources. The buildout of the STM site has been a step-wise process of planning and design, but much of the buildout was envisioned in the STM site-wide EA (DOE 2003). This supplement to that EA provides a more detailed description of proposed actions and detailed analyses of environmental impacts. Concerning negative consequences of additional cars, the vast majority of workers would work during normal hours and thus would not disturb adjoining neighborhoods during evening or night-time hours.

DOE would continue to follow the traffic mitigation action plan for the *Supplement to Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (EA 1440-S-1; May 2008). That plan reduces or eliminates significant impacts. The unprecedented growth NREL is experiencing will be tempered by offering flexible employee work schedules and remote work arrangements in order to lessen the number of trips to STM complex each week, among other items identified in the mitigation action plan. The mitigation measures are outlined in the 2008 supplement, which is available at http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/Reading_Room.aspx

2. **Comment:** Fire Department. While PV does not provide fire protection to the NREL campus the effect of increased traffic through the community may have an impact on response times and possibly how calls to the northern portion of the District may be responded to. However, depending on road improvements along the S Golden Road corridor the increase in traffic may be a non-issue. **(PVMD-6)**

Pros:

- Improvements to the S Golden Road corridor would be a positive in all aspects of life and safety issues regarding emergency services

Cons:

- Depending on the access option chosen, there may need to emergency signals installed in front of the fire station at 955 Moss St.
- Any option chosen will increase traffic in the District that may impact response time and response routes.

- The increased traffic volume may increase the number of calls due to Motor Vehicle Accidents (MVA), but from the fire departments point of view this would probably be a negligible increase.
- The intersection of 10th Ave and Moss St may need to be improved. PV Elementary School sits one block west of this intersection and during the school year traffic safety is already a concern.

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues (including emergency response) regarding this corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative. Features such as emergency signals, intersection improvements, and other safety concerns related to development of a specific route within this corridor would be considered after either a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is reached on this environmental assessment (EA) or a determination is made that an environmental impact statement (EIS) is required.

3. **Comment:** The Pleasant View Metropolitan District Overall (PVMD-7)

Pros:

- Any option would probably create the need to improve the S Golden Road corridor to allow for the increased traffic. This could also help with storm water issues (flooding and sand/gravel accumulation from flooding) that happen along this road in rain events.
- The development at DOE/NREL may ultimately enhance Pleasant Views main street - S Golden Road - by making it a more attractive location for businesses that directly or indirectly support DOE/NREL and its employees.
- Other possible enhancements along the S Golden Road corridor may include landscaping, bike paths/sidewalks thus creating a more pleasant and safe travel way for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Any improvements along the S Golden Road corridor should have a positive impact on District revenue streams as a result of redevelopment and new development.

Cons:

- Some long time residents may perceive any changes or growth as a negative.
- Which ever access route is chosen, there will be opposition by those in close proximity to that route.

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues regarding each corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative. Features such as existing road improvements, stormwater issues, alternative means of transportation, and other items related to development of a specific route within this corridor would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

4. **Comment:** With RTD Fastracks project progressing ahead of schedule, there may be a need for better pedestrian or bike access from south to north through Pleasant View (from light rail to DOE/NREL campus). Depending on which access route is chosen, this should be examined. (PVMD-9)

Response: Features related to development and design features of a specific route, including pedestrian and bicycle access, would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required. However, under the current FasTracks plans, the locations of stops/stations along the West Corridor and Gold Line Corridor are considerable distances from NREL facilities. DOE does not envision developing bike lanes or sidewalks over several miles on land that is not under its control. However, DOE does plan to continue outreach and partnerships to identify opportunities for using alternate modes of transportation and linking with infrastructure that local municipalities may provide. In accordance with the traffic mitigation plan, DOE will consider pedestrian and bicycle lanes in the secondary access road design.

5. **Comment:** The largest impact on the District will be the increase in traffic volume and the possible affects of this volume on emergency services provided. With proper planning much of this impact could be alleviated. We believe that DOE/NREL will be great neighbors to our Pleasant View Community Park at Camp George West and look forward to working with the DOE with its future in our community. (PVMD-10)

Response: Features related to development and design features of a specific route would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required. At that time, DOE would work closely with the Pleasant View Metropolitan District in the selection and implementation of a specific route.

DOE would continue to follow the traffic mitigation action plan for the *Supplement to Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (EA 1440-S-1; May 2008) to reduce impacts to insignificant levels. DOE and NREL have committed to monitoring traffic flow to confirm that mitigation measures are effective.

6. **Comment:** The City of Lakewood has reviewed the Draft Supplement with regard to transportation and has the following comments: The Study does not look at the long term effects of the project using 2030 traffic projections. This growth factor should be looked at to identify future improvements that may be limited if not considered now. The scope should include the I-70/Colfax interchange, Colfax/Indiana and South Golden Road under I-70. (COL-1)

Response: Traffic projections and impacts in 2012 and 2030 are considered in this SWEA/S-II under Section 3.1.2.2 for the intersections of all proposed second access corridors with South Golden Road. Additionally, in both traffic studies commissioned by DOE (FHU 2008 and Baseline 2009), both near-term (2010 and 2012) and long-term (2030) traffic impacts at the I-70/Colfax interchange, Colfax/Indiana, South Golden Road under I-70, and other intersections in the area have been assessed, and these impacts have been taken into consideration by DOE in the selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor.

DOE would continue to follow the traffic mitigation action plan for the *Supplement to Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (EA 1440-S-1; May 2008) to reduce impacts to insignificant levels. DOE and NREL have committed to monitoring traffic flow to confirm that mitigation measures are effective.

7. **Comment:** All three corridors (Quaker, Moss and Isabel) should provide strong pedestrian and bicycle elements. Either on-street bike lanes with sidewalks or bike paths should be recommended

and provided. Bike and Pedestrian connection through corridor D and B should be provided along with an east/west connection either on South Golden Road or 10th Avenue. (COL-5 & COL-6)

Response: Considering the step-wise process DOE is working within, features related to development and design features of a specific route, including pedestrian and bicycle transportation, would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

8. **Comment:** The City of Golden staff has the following comments: Vehicular access to the NREL research facilities has always been circuitous from the west and south. At the same time, research ties between Golden's Colorado School of Mines and NREL have been growing in number and depth. For this and other reasons of traffic circulation and potential emergency response, we support the concept of an additional vehicular access road connecting the campus to the Pleasant View/Golden area. (COG-1)

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues regarding a second access road and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative.

DOE would continue to follow the traffic mitigation action plan for the *Supplement to Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (EA 1440-S-1; May 2008) to reduce impacts to insignificant levels. DOE and NREL have committed to monitoring traffic flow to confirm that mitigation measures are effective.

9. **Comment:** 3.1.2 Traffic Pg. 29, Project Traffic Conditions Lines - 29 – 35 Comment: Traffic Analysis is incomplete. All of the proposed corridors would access South Golden Road. The traffic analysis does not show the impact of the second access road for South Golden Road between Isabel St. and Quaker St. Traffic along this stretch of road is already congested. What is the projected LOS for South Golden Road between Isabel St. and Quaker St. for 2012 and 2030? What is the current LOS? (JSLM-3)

Response: The traffic analysis was completed using standard traffic methodologies and modeling. Traffic congestion is modeled at intersections, where the actions of traffic lights and merging traffic are most affected by increases in traffic volume, and not for segments between intersections. In this SWEA/S-II, Table 3-2 provides the forecasted level of service (LOS) at the intersection of each alternative corridor with South Golden Road under baseline (current) conditions, when a corridor would *not* be used as a second access road, and under the Proposed Action, when a corridor would be used as a second access road. LOS is ranked by notations A through F, with A being the best level of service (no delays) and F being the worst level of service (major delays). As shown on Table 3-2, the projected LOS in 2012 for Quaker Street as a second access road would be an LOS of A in the morning and C in the evening; in 2030, the projected LOS would be E in the morning and F in the evening. Quaker Street currently (baseline) experiences an LOS of B during both morning and evening rush hours. Isabel Street as a second access road would be an LOS of A in the morning and B in the evening in 2012, and an LOS of B and D in 2030. Isabel Street currently functions with an LOS of A during both morning and evening rush hours.

DOE would continue to follow the traffic mitigation action plan for the *Supplement to Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (EA 1440-S-1; May 2008) to reduce impacts to insignificant levels.

10. **Comment:** Pg. 20, Table 3-2. Comparison of Traffic Impacts among Corridor Alternatives
Comment: Graph Methodology is questionable. a) How were percentage increases computed? b) Why is it assumed that for B/C Corridor the percentage increases are non-applicable? c) For the residents along Moss St. the percentage increase is equal to the corresponding anticipated traffic volume. d) Graph does not include traffic impacts for South Golden Road between Isabel St. and Quaker St. e) The projected LOS for South Golden Road should be evaluated against the projected LOS for DWP/DWMB corridor to ensure that the second access road does degrade the LOS to unacceptable levels for South Golden Road. **(JSLM-4)**

Response: a) The percentages are the calculated increase (or, in the case of Denver West Parkway, decrease) between the baseline conditions without the corridor as a second access and the conditions under the Proposed Action where the corridor would be used as a second access road. b) Because there is no road currently within Corridor B/C, there can be no calculated percent increase from baseline conditions. c) For residents adjacent to Corridor B/C, the traffic volumes that would traverse that corridor are quantified in Table 3-2. d) Traffic congestion is modeled at intersections, where the actions of traffic lights and merging traffic are most affected by increases in traffic volume, and not for segments between intersections. Table 3-2 provides the forecasted LOS at the intersection of each alternative corridor with South Golden Road under baseline conditions, when a corridor would *not* be used as a second access road, and under the Proposed Action, when a corridor would be used as a second access road. e) LOS conditions at the DWP/DWMB corridor under each of the corridor alternatives are included in Table 3-2. Neither corridor alternative would degrade the LOS to unacceptable levels at South Golden Road.

Corridor A Comments

11. **Comment:** You argue that the speed bumps along Quaker Street entry are an impediment; however, speed bumps should be used on any future roads that you plan to build, especially those bordering or going through park areas and adjoining neighborhoods. **(DD-5)**

Response: Final route design would take these factors into consideration.

12. **Comment:** The Pleasant View Metropolitan District respectfully submits our comments regarding the various proposed options for access to the DOE NREL campus and the proposed affect on the District and District Operations.

We will provide in our view, pros and cons of each proposed access option, the affects of each on the Pleasant View Metropolitan District Fire Department, the effects on Pleasant View Community Park at Camp George West and in our opinion the effects on the community as a whole. **(PVMD-1)**

Option A — Quaker Street

Pros:

- Traffic control already exists at this intersection but may need to be modified or upgraded for the anticipated increase in traffic.
- Quaker Street already exists thus limiting any additional new roads.

- There may be the possibility of additional parking on the NREL site for events at the Pleasant View Community Park at Camp George West (PVCPCGW) allowing for walk-in park access.
- This option may cause S Golden Road to be widened to Quaker Street from the east thus helping traffic flow along this corridor.
- No impact to PVCPCGW.

Cons:

- With the possible future traffic volume anticipated, there may have to be a widening of Quaker thus impacting property owners and lot sizes thus possibly reducing the revenue the District collects via property taxes.
- Quaker Street, being lined with residences, does not lend itself well to the anticipated traffic volume.
- Directly affects approx 20 residences.
- There is no direct access from major highways (I-70, US-6, US-40).

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues regarding this corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative. Features related to development of a specific route within this corridor would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

13. **Comment:** I am concerned that one part of this project, the new improved access road (referred to as Alternative A) utilizing Quaker Street will actually degrade traffic on Golden Hills Road/16th Ave which is not mentioned in the analysis (i.e., the analysis is deficient). The analysis indicates 1231 additional cars above baseline on a daily basis through the Quaker Street exit. By 2030 this is projected to be 1231 additional vehicles per day on Quaker Street (from Table 3-2 on page 30 of the draft EA). It is inevitable that some of this traffic will spill over into Golden residential neighborhoods (commuter traffic can easily proceed west on Golden Hills Road right into Golden residential neighborhoods instead of turning south on Quaker Street). How does DOE intend to address the traffic flow onto Golden Hills Road?

I know some of this traffic will flow onto residential streets such as Golden Hills Road because in 2008, NREL employees began using the Quaker Street exit as an alternate exit and there is a noticeable amount of traffic coming down Golden Hills Road (presumably a shortcut across 16th Ave westward to South Golden Road) instead of using Quaker Street to access South Golden Road. It appears to me that these commuters have little concern for residential neighborhoods they are cutting through (a lot of speeding and extra traffic can't be good for property values or little kiddies). I suggest that NREL designate the Quaker Street entrance/exit for bike commuters and emergency use only. If the Quaker Street exit is chosen some sort of traffic control mechanism needs to be installed on Golden Hills Road. (TJO-1)

Response: Golden Hills Road and 16th Avenue were considered for analysis but were not analyzed as an alternative due to the difficult logistics (i.e., routes, length, access points, and road design) involved in routing traffic to STM from those roads. Traffic projections and impacts are considered in

this SWEA/S-II for the intersections of all proposed second access corridors within South Golden Road. Additionally, in both traffic studies commissioned by DOE (FHU 2008 and Baseline 2009), both near-term (2010 and 2012) and long-term (2030) traffic impacts in Corridor A, B/C, B/D, B/D/E, E, and other intersections in the area have been assessed, and these impacts have been taken into consideration by DOE in the selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor. Therefore, the traffic analysis done for this SWEA/S-II is sufficient.

Section 2.3 of this SWEA/S-II lists the reasons for selecting Corridor B/C. Features related to development of a specific route within this corridor would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

DOE would continue to follow the traffic mitigation action plan for the *Supplement to Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (EA 1440-S-1; May 2008) to reduce impacts to insignificant levels. DOE and NREL have committed to monitoring traffic flow to confirm that mitigation measures are effective.

Corridor B/C Comments

14. **Comment:** We are writing regarding the proposed road running from the Moss Street and Old Golden Road boundary, through the Pleasant View Park, and along the west boundary of the said property, to the Denver West Blvd. that runs through NREL. This road would constitute a major inconvenience and health risk to the private homeowners along the road that adjoins that property. The pollution from the additional exhaust could cause or aggravate the respiratory system problems of the population (which includes children, senior citizens). **(DD-1)**

Response: As discussed in Section 3.1.2.2, DOE estimates that the increased traffic that would utilize a new second access road would represent less than one-tenth of one percent of the regional traffic. Such an increase would not result in measurable health effects.

15. **Comment:** The head lights and noise from vehicles would disturb daily routines and evening rest (sleep). This would be especially true with the increase of hundreds of new employees and 24 hour, 7 day a week schedules that you have described. **(DD-2)**

Response: The vast majority of workers would work regular daytime hours between 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM and as a result would not affect night-time sleep of nearby residents.

DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues relative to the proposed corridors and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative. Features related to development of a specific route within this corridor would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

16. **Comment:** In addition, you would be establishing a route through a park that has plans for children at play (organized sports and general recreational play). **(DD-3)**

Response: DOE recognizes that this corridor option is in close proximity to the developed portion of Pleasant View Community Park. Section 2.3 of the SWEA/S-II explains the reasons for selecting the preferred alternative. Given that this alternative would not result in a specific route within the corridor, final route selection would take these safety issues and other factors into consideration in route selection and final design.

17. **Comment:** Dumping more parking lots and roads among existing residential communities seems unnecessary and unfair to those residents. You do have other existing options for the proposed lots and roads. (DD-4)

Response: DOE evaluated building, access roads, parking, and open space locations along with proximity to the surrounding neighborhoods in its 2003 *Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (SWEA) before advancing its plans for the buildout of the STM site. This SWEA/S-II evaluates in more detail the implementation of the decisions resulting from the 2003 SWEA but does not revisit the plans for the buildout of the STM site.

18. **Comment:** We also have concerns about the existing natural gas pipe line which runs along the west border of the properties in question [B/C Corridor]. There has been a commitment by NREL not to build a road over the pipeline. However, constant vibrations from excessive traffic and construction close to the pipe could produce damage to the seams of the pipe line and cause fire and explosions. (DD-8)

Response: DOE would consider the existing gas pipeline in its route selection and final roadway design.

19. **Comment:** The Pleasant View Metropolitan District Corridor Pros and Cons continued (PVMD-2)

Option B/C — Moss St/McIntyre St

Pros:

- A high pressure gas main exists along the western park boundary that creates a buffer zone and/or wildlife corridor between the proposed roadway and the neighborhood.
- This option may afford additional access to the PVCPCGW.
- Possibly additional parking at PVCPCGW.
- There may be the possibility of a small commercial development at Moss Street and S Golden Road thus slightly increasing District revenue streams.
- Better traffic control at the Moss St and S Golden Road intersection for improved emergency response.
- The intersection of 10th and Moss may need to be improved due to increased traffic volume.
- Relatively direct route from highways (US 6, Hwy 40 and I-70) to NREL campus
- Of the proposed options that impact PVCPCGW, this option impacts it the least.

Cons:

- Traffic in front of fire station, emergency signal?
- Affects approx 9 residences

- Requires amending the PVCPCGW master plan
- Would improvements to Moss Street from Colfax to S Golden Road be needed?

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues relative to this corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative. Features related to development of a specific route within this corridor would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

20. **Comment:** More specifically regarding your plans to improve access to your facility, we support the Moss Street connection. It appears that it will provide the least impact to neighboring residents, and it will provide access to the Jefferson County Open Space baseball field. With an expanding campus, we believe it is absolutely critical that this access becomes available. (JEC-2)

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues relative to this corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative.

21. **Comment:** As for the second access road, in my opinion the B/C corridor would have the least amount of impact on any thing at CGW or the community. Mostly natural vegetation (field), new crossing of Lena Gulch and effects up to 2 private residences. The A corridor would not affect CGW at all as it is widening of Quaker St. this is a big impact on the residences on Quaker. I agree with Capt. Barba, Kilmer Street would be bad for us and would not be easy to do a ROW on as it is somehow given to Jeff. Co. in an easement but the State still is responsible for it (part of the CGW deal of 1999 with DMA). (CDPS-1)

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues regarding this corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative.

22. **Comment:** Preference for secondary access would be at the B/C corridor (Moss St.). The EA should analyze for a potential signal at South Golden Rd and Moss Street or other alternative. The study should continue the analysis on Moss St. to Colfax Ave to determine recommended improvements. (COL-3)

Response: DOE has identified Corridor B/C as the preferred alternative in this final SWEA/S-II. Additionally, possible intersection improvements at South Golden Road have been included in this SWEA/S-II for each corridor alternative. Features related to development and design of a specific route would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required. At that time, DOE would work closely with Jefferson County, the Pleasant View Metro District, the City of Lakewood, and the City of Golden.

23. **Comment:** Using Moss St. as the preferred alternative would utilize the I-70/Colfax interchange better and provide better relief to I-70/Denver West Marriott interchange compared to using Isabel or Quaker. (COL-4)

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues regarding the alternative corridors and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative.

24. **Comment:** Of the several alternative locations and designs depicted in the draft EA report, we believe that the alternatives related to corridors “B” and “C” are best suited for this additional roadway. They provide the most direct connections to Old Golden Road and West Colfax Avenue,

without substantial impact to low volume streets. Moss and McIntyre Streets are already the primary corridors between Colfax and Golden Road, and provide the best opportunity for safe use by motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists. Of the two points of connection to Golden Road, the Moss Street alignment seems preferential, however, we would defer to NREL and Jefferson County Highways and Transportation staff for this determination. (COG-2)

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues regarding this corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative. Features related to development of a specific route within this corridor, including pedestrian and bicycle alternatives, would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

25. **Comment:** Our [City of Golden] support of these alternatives is contingent upon the following:

- Approval by Jefferson County of all applicable studies, design documents and necessary permits for such roadway construction.
- Appropriate accommodation for pedestrians and bicycle access into the NREL campus. (COG-3)

Response: Features related to development and design of a specific route would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required. At that time, DOE would work closely with Jefferson County, the Pleasant View Metro District, the City of Lakewood, and the City of Golden.

26. **Comment:** Pg. 26, Lines 1- 12 Comment - Description is incomplete. Corridor B is Jefferson County Open Space and is adjacent to a residential area along Moss St. (JSLM-1)

Response: The fact that Corridor B is county land is noted on Table 3-1. The fact that there are residences that would be indirectly affected by a route within this corridor is noted in several impact sections (such as noise and visual impacts) and in a new Table 2-3 in this final SWEA/S-II. DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues regarding this corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative.

27. **Comment:** Pg. 27, Second Access Road - Line 10-12 - Corridor B Comment: Assessment of Impact is inaccurate. The natural vegetation is Jefferson County Open Space and is directly adjacent to 6 residential homes along Moss Street. Conversion of this open space into a roadway will have a direct impact on the six residences along this corridor. Impacts include loss of designated open space, a totally new traffic corridor where none existed previously, increased noise, increased pollution, new street lighting, and snowplow noise. (JSLM-2)

Response: The fact that Corridor B is county property is noted on Table 3-1. There are no private residences within Corridor B that could be directly affected, as noted in Section 3.1.1.2. The indirect impacts on the six residences adjacent to Corridor B are noted in Sections 3.1.4.2 (visual impacts), 3.1.11.2 (noise), and 3.1.8.3 (air quality) and are summarized on Table 2-3 of this final SWEA/S-II. DOE has considered those impacts in its decision-making, along with impacts of the other alternative corridors.

28. **Comment:** Alternative B/C seems like the least impact to private residences and is also one of the shortest routes to the new parking lots. (TJO-2)

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues regarding this corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative.

Corridor B/D Comments

29. **Comment:** The Pleasant View Metropolitan District Corridor Pros and Cons continued (**PVMD-3**)

Option D/B — Kilmer Street/Park

Pros:

- A portion already exists though the CGW state campus
- Impacts the least number of residents in the District.

Cons:

- Road alignment would bisect park.
- Traffic fed off of an already busy S Golden Road
- Kilmer Street through CGW would require major improvements to accommodate the anticipated traffic.
- Issues with the state, widening of Kilmer through CGW campus, etc.
- Not wise use of available land
- Would require a major re-working of the concept and design of the PVCPCGW

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues regarding this corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative. Features related to development of a specific route within this corridor would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

Corridor B/D/E Comments

30. **Comment:** The Pleasant View Metropolitan District Corridor Pros and Cons continued (**PVMD-4**)

Option E/D/B — Isabell St/Park

Pros:

- Improvement possible at intersection of Isabell St and S Golden Road
- Possible parking on NREL Campus for PVCPCGW

Cons:

- Road alignment would bisect park

- Not wise use of available land
- Would require a major reworking of the concept and design of the PVCPCGW

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues regarding this corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative. Features related to development of a specific route within this corridor would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

Corridor E Comments

31. **Comment:** The Pleasant View Metropolitan District Corridor Pros and Cons continued (PVMD-5)

Option E — Isabell Street

Pros:

- Possible intersection improvement at Isabell St and S Golden Road
- Could lead to commercial development of old trailer park on east side of Isabell St, increasing District tax revenues.
- No direct impact on park property.
- Possible park on NREL campus for PVCPCGW
- Relatively direct route to NREL campus

Cons:

- Affects approx 10 residences
- Does not allow for separate access to DOE/NREL campus, rather it utilizes the existing main gate.
- No direct access to major highways.

Response: DOE recognizes the characteristics and issues regarding this corridor and has taken them into consideration in its selection of Corridor B/C as the preferred corridor alternative. Features related to development of a specific route within this corridor would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

Existing Denver West Entrance Comments

32. **Comment:** We believe that the east entrance would be a more convenient and satisfactory access to the facility from the I-70 Denver West exit and entry ramps. The median at the present entry road to NREL could easily be modified to accommodate two lanes each way. You could possibly add a (no more than 2 stories above ground and/or an underground) parking garage on the north side of the entry way (just east of the new building). The road running in front of the facility (Denver West Blvd.) could be widened. (DD-6)

Response: DOE's determination that a second access road is essential is based in part on traffic studies that concluded that, even with lane expansion, the traffic flow on Denver West Boulevard would reach an unacceptable LOS with the projected staffing increases. But consideration of the safety of operation and emergency access were also part of DOE's determination that a second access road is necessary. DOE evaluated building, access roads, parking, and open space locations along with proximity to the surrounding neighborhoods in its 2003 *Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (SWEA) before advancing its plans for the buildout of the STM site. This SWEA/S-II evaluates in more detail the implementation of the decisions resulting from the SWEA but does not revisit the plans for the buildout of the STM site. The suggested location for parking on the north side of the current access road is appreciated, and NREL has plans to place a small parking lot there within the context of locating like-purpose buildings near each other. Research facilities and laboratories are planned to be clustered to promote connectivity of research staff and a sustainable facility as a pedestrian-oriented campus to minimize on-site traffic. Office buildings and parking areas are also clustered and located close to campus egress to promote the pedestrian-oriented campus.

DOE would continue to follow the traffic mitigation action plan for the *Supplement to Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (EA 1440-S-1; May 2008) to reduce impacts to insignificant levels. DOE and NREL have committed to monitoring traffic flow to confirm that mitigation measures are effective.

33. **Comment:** There appears to be room for parking in front of, next to and/or behind some of the buildings along Denver West Blvd. (DD-7)

Response: DOE evaluated building, access roads, parking, and open space locations along with proximity to the surrounding neighborhoods in its 2003 *Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (SWEA) before finalizing its plans for the buildout of the STM site. This SWEA/S-II evaluates in more detail the implementation of the decisions resulting from the 2003 SWEA but does not revisit the plans for the buildout of the STM site.

NREL has reviewed these areas for parking and has determined that these areas are less desirable for the amount of parking spaces necessary due to a number of factors, including stormwater management, availability of utilities, traffic and pedestrian circulation, and cost among others.

DOE would continue to follow the traffic mitigation action plan for the *Supplement to Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (EA 1440-S-1; May 2008) to reduce impacts to insignificant levels. DOE and NREL have committed to monitoring traffic flow to confirm that mitigation measures are effective.

34. **Comment:** We might add that the property in question [north of the current entrance] would make an appropriate park and recreational area for the many employees at NREL. Even one small parking lot accessible from Denver West Blvd. might be possible. (DD-9)

Response: DOE evaluated building, access roads, parking, and open space locations along with proximity to the surrounding neighborhoods in its 2003 *Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (SWEA) before advancing its plans for the buildout of the STM site. This SWEA/S-II evaluates in more detail the

implementation of the decisions resulting from the 2003 SWEA but does not revisit the plans for the buildout of the STM site.

NREL's site planning efforts have identified this area as best suited for additional research and support facilities. Additional parking associated with these structures would be considered.

35. **Comment:** Short term improvements at Denver West Marriott Blvd/Denver West Parkway should be included as recommendation to the EA. (COL-2)

Response: In SWEA/S-I, DOE committed to requesting funding for the addition of a second right-turn lane from eastbound Denver West Parkway onto Denver West Marriott Boulevard. The most current traffic studies commissioned to support this SWEA/S-II have assumed the presence of the additional right-turn lane in projecting impacts at the intersection in that area.

WILDLIFE CORRIDOR COMMENTS

36. **Comment:** We believe a wild life corridor from South Table Mountain to Lena Gulch, between Moss Street and McIntyre Street would benefit the wild life and people alike for the following reasons:

It would permit the deer grazing on the Table Mountain to water at Lena Gulch. This is critical during drought years.

Deer herds grazing on South Table Mountain could seek shelter under the trees at and around Lena Gulch during severe cold or other inclement weather.

If the wild life had a corridor to move directly from South Table Mountain to Lena Gulch, they would wander less through the NREL facilities.

A wild life corridor along the west side of NREL property would help create community support for the building expansion taking place at NREL

In conclusion, the deer herds graze mostly on the top of South Table Mountain but seek shelter and water around Lena Gulch. Other small animals, like the coyotes, also move between South Table Mountain and the Lena Gulch area. We believe that the wild life and the Pleasant View Community would benefit from a wild life corridor. (DD-11)

Response: As demonstrated by the establishment of the 170 acres of conservation easement lands on the east side of the STM site, DOE is committed to consideration of wildlife needs in its decision-making regarding the buildout of the STM site. DOE recognizes that wildlife utilize both South Table Mountain and Lena Gulch and, to the extent practicable, would take this fact into consideration in building, roadway, and security feature locations and design. Currently, our security fence inhibits wildlife movement between the conservation easement and Lena Gulch. In future planning, DOE will continue to consider wildlife movement as site development activities proceed. Wildlife movement in suburban areas is a difficult issue. DOE is considering wildlife movement corridors along some of the natural drainageways that may be more naturally appropriate and minimize traffic-wildlife interactions. However, NREL will balance concerns for wildlife with security requirements in its overall planning efforts.

Features related to development and design of a specific route would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

GENERAL SUPPORT COMMENTS

37. **Comment:** Jefferson Economic Council sincerely appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on your Environmental Assessment. NREL is a huge asset to our community and a driver of our new energy economy. This is true now more than ever as you continue to expand and hire literally hundreds of new employees. You are one of the bright spots in our otherwise sluggish economy. It was a pleasure to support the expansion during your public meeting this summer. (JEC-1)

Response: DOE appreciates the support of the Jefferson Economic Council for the expansion of NREL's STM site.

AIR QUALITY COMMENTS

38. **Comment:** Missing analysis. Where is the air quality analysis that shows the impact of increased emissions generated by the increase in traffic from the second access road? Please provide this analysis for each proposed corridor for the second access road. (JSLM-5)

Response: Text added to Section 3.1.8 of this final SWEA/S-II indicates that the projected increase in traffic resulting from the staffing increases at NREL would be less than one-tenth of one percent in a regional traffic volume that is increasing at an average of one percent per year without NREL's expansion. At this very low level of traffic increase, quantified health effects can be neither meaningfully calculated nor differentiated among alternatives.

VISUAL ANALYSIS COMMENTS

39. **Comment:** 3.1.4 Visual Quality/Aesthetics - pg. 34 – 39 Comment: Missing Views Please provide views or renderings from the western perspective, particularly of the proposed parking lots and structures. (JSLM-6)

Response: The numerous visual simulations provided adequately assess the visual impact of the Proposed Action to support decision-making. The views as presented from the south facing north provide a context for neighbors west and southwest of the site to interpret a western perspective.

40. **Comment:** The District requests that any security fence installed on the southern border of the DOE/NREL campus be landscaped such that it appears more aesthetically pleasing. This park is bounded on the south by the Camp George West Campus that includes a Department of Corrections (DOC) facility and utilizes high security fence with razor wire. Depending on the type of security fence utilized at the DOE/NREL campus, there could be more than 60% of the perimeter of the PVCPCGW that has 6 foot chain link with barbed or razor wire top-dressing. (PVMD-8)

Response: Features related to final design of site security would be considered after either a FONSI is reached on this EA or a determination is made that an EIS is required.

41. **Comment:** Pg. 36 Second Access Road -Line 37 -41 Comment: Mitigation Plan. Development of Mitigation Plans should require residential input and approval. Mock ups and drawings should be provided during the design phase for public comment and approval and should be part of the visual mitigation plan. (JSLM-8)

Response: Through the NEPA process, DOE has identified issues of concern, such as lighting, traffic, and noise associated with site development. DOE is committed to minimizing impacts to the extent practicable, based on public input received to date. At this time, DOE does not anticipate seeking further public comment.

PARKING STRUCTURE COMMENTS

42. **Comment:** Pg.36 Multi-Story Parking- Line 19-35 Comment: Mitigation Plan Development of Lighting Mitigation Plan should require residential input and approval. Mock-ups and drawings should be provided during the design phase for public comment and approval and should be part of the lighting mitigation plan. (JSLM-7)

Response: Through the NEPA process, DOE has identified issues of concern, such as lighting, traffic, and noise associated with site development. DOE is committed to minimizing impacts to the extent practicable, based on public input received to date. At this time, DOE does not anticipate seeking further public comment.

NOISE COMMENTS

43. **Comment:** 3.1.11 Noise Pg. 63 Second Access Road Operations Comment: Mitigation Plans Development of Mitigation Plans should require residential input and approval. For all corridor proposals, noise mitigation plans should include sound berms and/or barriers and require residential approval. (JSLM-9)

Response: Through the NEPA process, DOE has identified issues of concern, such as lighting, traffic, and noise associated with site development. DOE is committed to minimizing impacts to the extent practicable, based on public input received to date. At this time, DOE does not anticipate seeking further public comment.

EIS REQUIRED

44. **Comment:** In terms of NEPA process, I'm not sure a FONSI can be reached on any of the alternatives presented relative to traffic. Looking at the volumes of traffic and the projected degradation of service, I believe an Environmental Impact Statement is warranted. (TJO-3)

Response: As summarized in this SWEA/S-II and detailed in the traffic studies, under any of the second access road alternatives, the predicted LOS would not result in unacceptable traffic flows; therefore, traffic impacts under the Proposed Action would not be significant.

DOE would continue to follow the traffic mitigation action plan for the *Supplemental to Final Site-Wide Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's South Table Mountain Complex* (EA 1440-S-1; May 2008), which reduces or eliminates significant impacts. The mitigation measures are outlined in the 2008 supplement, which is available at http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/Reading_Room.aspx.

45. **Comment:** The fact that NREL is on the second supplement to an existing EA further demonstrates that segmentation has been occurring to avoid preparation of an EIS. (TJO-4)

Response: As discussed in the SWEA/S-II, DOE is evaluating proposed actions that implement the buildout decisions reached under the 2003 SWEA as funding is provided by Congress. The fact that this is the second supplement to the SWEA reflects timely evaluation of projects as they are funded, not segmentation. Supplement analyses are consistent with DOE's NEPA regulations, as is the preparation of an EA to determine whether a FONSI is appropriate or an EIS is required.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES

46. **Comment:** One other NEPA question relative to alternatives; has NREL considered other viable alternatives:

- a) not developing the South Table Mountain site and instead locating the facilities at other facilities or locations? How about putting facilities or offices at the Federal Center in Lakewood? How about NREL test center up on Highway 93?
- b) how about a new westbound exit ramp directly connecting I-70 to Denver West Parkway going between Isabelle Street and the office building and a new eastbound I-70 on ramp in the same location? (TJO-5)

Response: a) Relocating NREL is not a reasonable alternative and is outside the scope of this document. DOE has an existing site and a site plan. With national priorities focusing on developing renewable energy resources, moving the site would cause unreasonable delays at a critical time for our nation. b) This approach would still require the use of Corridor E, which is evaluated in this SWEA/S-II. However, Corridor E was not chosen as the preferred alternative.